



219

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-55192-2023 (o&m)
DECIDED ON: 18.02.2025**

SHISHIR MOHI**....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB****....RESPONDENT****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL**

Present: Mr. Keshavam Chaudhary, Advocate,
Ms. Hargun Sandhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Jasjit Singh Rattu, DAG Punjab.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

The jurisdiction of this Court has been invoked under Section 439 Cr.P.C., seeking regular bail to the petitioner in case FIR No. 217 dated 29.9.2022 registered under Sections 419, 420, 467, & 120-B IPC and Section 66-C, 66-D of Information Technology (Amendment) Act, 2008, Section 506, 201 IPC added later on at P.S. Moti Nagar, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana.

The learned State Counsel points out at the outset that Section 414 of the IPC was introduced on 06.06.2023, yet it was not mentioned in the petition and was deliberately withheld. This is particularly significant as the petition was filed on 30.10.2023. Furthermore, the State's reply, dated 30.12.2023, clearly raised this issue, but the petitioner failed to bring it to the Bench's attention, ultimately securing interim bail.

On the other hand, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that there was no intentional concealment of the aforementioned fact, as the petitioner was unaware of it at the time of filing the petition. He therefore prays for the withdrawal of the present petition.

Without going further into the controversy, prayer of the petitioner is accepted.

Petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to take appropriate measures as per law.

Pending application(s), if any shall disposed off accordingly.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

18.02.2025

Meenu

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>